



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1111/add.14015](https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14015)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Neale, J., Bouteloup, A., Getty, M., Hogan, C., Lennon, P., Mc Cusker, M., & Strang, J. S. (2017). Why we should conduct research in collaboration with people who use alcohol and other drugs. *Addiction*, 112(12), 2084-2085. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14015>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **WHY WE SHOULD CONDUCT RESEARCH IN COLLABORATION WITH PEOPLE WHO USE ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS**

**Manuscript type:** Editorial

### **Authors**

Joanne Neale, Professor<sup>1,2 \*</sup>

Annabel Bouteloup, SURG member<sup>2</sup>

Mel Getty, SURG member<sup>2</sup>

Cassandra Hogan, SURG member<sup>2</sup>

Paul Lennon, SURG member<sup>2</sup>

Martin Mc Cusker, SURG member<sup>2</sup>

John Strang, Professor<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Addiction Centre, King's College London, 4 Windsor Walk, Denmark Hill, London, SE5 8BB

<sup>2</sup> Service User Research Group (SURG), c/o Aurora Project, 140 Stockwell Road, Brixton, London, SW9 9TQ

### **\*Corresponding Author**

Joanne Neale, Professor Addictions Qualitative Research, National Addiction Centre, King's College London, 4 Windsor Walk, Denmark Hill, London, SE5 8BB, Email: [joanne.neale@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:joanne.neale@kcl.ac.uk)

Word Length: 1,000

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:**

Joanne Neale is part-funded by, and John Strang is supported by, the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre for Mental Health at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health. JN receives honoraria and some expenses from *Addiction* journal in her role as Commissioning Editor and Senior Qualitative Editor. JS is a clinician and researcher and has worked extensively on clinical trials and wider research and has contributed to clinical guidelines on treatment types and provision. JS's employer (King's College London) receives, connected to his work, project grant support and/or honoraria and/or consultancy payments from government agencies, charitable sources and also from pharmaceutical companies, including funding for clinical trials and research studies (for fuller information see [www.kcl.ac.uk/ioppn/depts/addictions/people/hod.aspx](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/ioppn/depts/addictions/people/hod.aspx) ).

## **WHY WE SHOULD CONDUCT RESEARCH IN COLLABORATION WITH PEOPLE WHO USE ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS**

*Collaborative research is more than a list of involvement activities; it is a mindset requiring receptiveness to new ideas, trust, respect, effort and resources. There are utilitarian, ethical, epistemological and consequentialist arguments for taking the time to do it well.*

If you have ever struggled to recruit participants to your trial, discovered that the results of your survey are compromised by missing data, wondered why interviewees in a qualitative study did not grasp the point of your questions, or been disappointed that your research findings were not enthusiastically embraced by the treatment sector, then this editorial - on conducting research in collaboration with people who use substances - might be for you.

Terminology used to describe the concept we are discussing is confusing. We here refer to 'collaborative research', meaning researchers working 'with' members of the group being studied *throughout* the research process. We distinguish this from: i. participation in research (where members of the group studied are involved as research participants); ii. engagement in research (where information about research is shared with members of the group studied); and iii user-led research (where those directing the research are members of the group studied; e.g. people in treatment researching that treatment for themselves)<sup>[1,2]</sup>.

The term 'collaborative research' is often used interchangeably with 'service user involvement in research', 'patient and public involvement in research', and 'community involvement in research'. Language is crucial, and the best form of words to use will depend on context and political perspective<sup>[3]</sup>. For a treatment study, 'patient involvement' may seem appropriate, yet be offensive to those who do not consider themselves to be 'sick'. 'Service user' may capture those in treatment, but exclude those who are not currently accessing services. Even the word 'involvement' is challenging since it refers to a continuum of activities, e.g. advising, assisting, and being equal partners in the research process<sup>[4,5]</sup>.

In this editorial, we focus on the principles and practices of collaboration rather than on semantics. Common strategies are asking people who use substances to: identify topics requiring further study; join a project advisory group; help design a study intervention; comment on the feasibility of using particular research methods; suggest appropriate outcome measures; co-write participant information sheets; prepare lay summaries; advise on interview topic guides; recruit study participants; assist with data collection and analyses; and contribute to dissemination activities<sup>[3,6-11]</sup>. Piloting is not generally viewed as involvement, but can be if feedback is collated and used to inform the study going forwards.

Collaboration is, however, much more than a list of 'involvement' activities. It is a mindset, requiring all parties to trust, respect and value each other; and to function as a team. People who use substances need to recognize that there are rules and conventions of research, including deadlines, over which researchers may not have control. Researchers must be willing to change their views and amend study designs depending on what people who use substances tell them. Addiction studies are routinely conducted by multi-disciplinary teams of scientists who have different perspectives and knowledge. Just as health economists, statisticians or qualitative researchers bring distinct but valued understanding to any study, so people who use substances have their own expertise (they are 'experts by experience'). Furthermore, just as statisticians do not need to comprehend qualitative research or qualitative researchers do not need to be proficient in health economics, so people who use substances do not need to understand all aspects of the study to contribute meaningfully.

Within collaborative research, there is no place for tokenism. Tokenism might include inviting the same person onto every project advisory group, asking someone for their views and then ignoring their responses, or treating involvement as an afterthought (e.g. designing the study intervention and then asking a person who uses substances to 'approve' or 'sanction' what has already been decided). Good collaborative research requires effort and resources. Researchers need to ensure that people who use substances have all the information they need but are not overloaded with unnecessary information. Payment needs to be discussed and, if payment is not available, alternative forms of compensation or

reciprocity should be considered<sup>1</sup>. It is also important to ask people who use substances how they prefer to collaborate (e.g. doing what activities, when, where, for how long, and using what communication media). Additionally, researchers must offer support, mentoring or training when asking people to participate in activities that may be unfamiliar to them.

This, of course, leaves an important question. Why should researchers collaborate given the evident effort and costs required? This seems pertinent given that there is actually no good evidence quantifying the benefits of involving people who use substances in conducting research. To begin, there is a (rather mercenary) utilitarian argument: research funders often expect and request collaboration. Then there is an ethical and moral argument: people who use substances have a right to be involved in research that affects them. Next, there is an epistemological argument: people who have used services or experienced particular life circumstances have valuable first-hand information that researchers tend not to have but need to know<sup>[3,12-16]</sup>.

Our own experiences of research collaboration over the last four years have also highlighted consequentialist arguments. We alluded to some of these in our opening paragraph but expand here. First, collaboration can bring credibility to a study; increasing recruitment and trust in the findings. Second, collaboration forces researchers to learn how to explain their studies clearly to those whom they want to participate, so increasing interest and engagement. Third, collaboration can help to minimize the chances that study documentation, questionnaires and research reports inadvertently use language that is stigmatizing, offensive or overly technical. Fourth collaboration can prevent researchers making naïve judgments about how interventions will work in the real world. Fifth, collaboration enables researchers to report their results more confidently, knowing that the study population shares some responsibility for the findings. Sixth (and we appreciate that this is not a scientific justification but it seems important to mention all the same), we genuinely enjoy working together, have learnt much from each other, and believe that everyone has gained something personally from the process.

---

<sup>1</sup> In our own collaborations, researchers who did not have budgets have, for example, offered to mentor service users applying for jobs, college places or student bursaries.

## References

1. Rose D. The contemporary state of service-user-led research. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2015; **2**: 959-60.
2. Involve. What is public involvement in research? National Institute for Health Research; 2017. Available from: <http://www.invo.org.uk/find-out-more/what-is-public-involvement-in-research-2/>
3. Trivedi P., Wykes T. From passive subjects to equal partners: qualitative review of user involvement in research. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 2002; **181**: 468-72.
4. Arnstein SR. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 1969; **35**: 216-24.
5. Poulton BC. User involvement in identifying health needs and shaping and evaluating services: is it being realised? *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 1999; **30**: 1289-96.
6. Elliott E, Watson A, Harries U. Harnessing expertise: involving peer interviewers in qualitative research with hard-to-reach populations. *Health Expectations* 2002; **5**: 172-8.
7. Angell KL, Kreshka MA, McCoy R, Donnelly P, Turner-Cobb JM, Graddy K, Kraemer HC, Koopman C. Psychosocial intervention for rural women with breast cancer. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2003; **18**: 499-507.
8. Hewlett S, Cockshott Z, Byron M, Kitchen K, Tipler S, Pope D, Hehir M. Patients' perceptions of fatigue in rheumatoid arthritis: overwhelming, uncontrollable, ignored. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2005; **53**: 697-702.

9. Gooberman-Hill R, Horwood J, Calnan M. Citizens' juries in planning research priorities: process, engagement and outcome. *Health Expectations* 2008; **11**: 272–81.
10. Oliver S, Armes DG, Gyte G. Public involvement in setting a national research agenda: a mixed methods evaluation. *The Patient: Patient Centred Outcomes Research* 2009; **2**: 179–90.
11. Boote J, Baird W, Sutton A. Public involvement in the design and conduct of clinical trials: a review. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences* 2011; **5**: 91–111.
12. Fudge N, Wolfe C, McKevitt C. Assessing the promise of user involvement in health service development: ethnographic study. *British Medical Journal* 2008; **336**: 313.
13. Ward PR, Thompson J, Barber R, Armitage CJ, Boote JD, Cooper CL, Jones GL. Critical perspectives on 'consumer involvement' in health research: epistemological dissonance and the know-do gap. *Journal of Sociology* 2010; **46**: 63–82.
14. Gibson A, Britten N, Lynch J. Theoretical directions for an emancipatory concept of patient and public involvement. *Health* 2012; **16**: 531–47.
15. Goodare H., Lockward S. Involving patients in clinical research. *British Medical Journal* 1999; **319**: 724-5.
16. SchARR. Patient and public involvement in research. The University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research, PPI; 2017. Available from: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/scharr/ppi>